



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/522,950	03/10/2000	Yoshihiro Kikuchi	0039-7606-2	4581
22850	2850 7590 05/14/2004		EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			DIEP, NHON THANH	
1940 DUKE S ALEXANDRI	TREET A, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	<b>,</b>		2613	-
			DATE MAILED: 05/14/2004	8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No.	Applicant(s)				
09/522,950	KIKUCHI ET AL.				
Examiner	Art Unit				
Nhon T Diep	2613				
ion appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address				
TION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a ation. 1ys, a reply within the statutory minimum of the ry period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC by statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed  irty (30) days will be considered timely.  NTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
n 2/19/2004.					
This action is non-final.					
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
ication. vithdrawn from consideration. n and/or election requirement.					
n to the drawing(s) be held in abeya correction is required if the drawin	nnce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  12) △ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) △ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  1. △ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
948) Paper No 0/SB/08) 5) Notice of	(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
	Examiner Nhon T Diep  TON Appears on the cover sheet with the REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 Mation.  TOR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a sation.  TOR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a sation.  TOR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a sation.  To period will apply and will expire SIX (b) Mo by statute, cause the application to become a he mailing date of this communication, even in the mailing date of this communication, even in a sation.  This action is non-final.  allowance except for formal manual ander Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.I.  This action requirement.  To accepted or b) objected to the drawing of the drawing of the Examiner.  To to the drawing(s) be held in abeyout the Examiner. Note the attached of the Examiner. Note the attached of the priority documents have been received.  The priority documents have been received in the priority documents have been received.  The priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  To a list of the certified copies not satisfied.  To be priority documents have been satisfied.  To a list of the certified copies not satisfied.  To be priority documents have been satisfied.  The priority documents have been satisfied.	Description   Description			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Application/Control Number: 09/522,950 Page 2

**Art Unit: 2613** 

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 2/19/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With regard to the applicants' argument that Koz (US 5,990,955) relates to MPEG-2 (versus MPEG-4). More specifically, the macroblocks relied upon in the outstanding Office Action are described in Koz as being block array representing the luminance four blocks 3/10 of pixel luminance and two blocks 3/12 representing interpolated pixel chrominance. These macro-blocks do not correspond to an area image signal. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

With regard to the argument that the pending claims recite MPEG-4 features versus Koz's MPEG-2 teachings. First of all, the claims themselves do not clearly recite MPEG-4 as argued and secondly, as is well known there are many common features between these two standards and that broadly claims will be broadly rejected as in this particular case.

With regard to the argument that macro-blocks do not correspond to an area image signal. Again, claim 1 recites "...coding the area image signal into an area image code string,..". It is the examiner's opinion that macro-blocks do represent an area signal and when being encoded, the results do represent an area image code string.

The examiner does believes that all broadly claimed limitation of claim 1 has been met by Koz and therefore, he maintains all of the pending rejections as of paper #6 and repeat as follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Application/Control Number: 09/522,950

Art Unit: 2613

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Koz (US 5,990,955) as cited in paper #6.

## Conclusion

4. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon T Diep whose telephone number is 703-305-4648. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris S Kelley can be reached on 703 305-4856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ND

**12** May 2004

NHON DIEP RIMARY EXAMINER